DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 311 563 EA 021 334

AUTHOR Stoloff, David L.
TITLE The Social Context of Educational Partnerships: A Semantic Review.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 32p.; For related paper, see EA 021 332. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989). Supported in part by the California Academic Partnership Program, the Southern California ACCESS Centers and Network, and California State University.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agency Cooperation; *College School Cooperation; Cooperative Education; Cultural Influences; *Educational Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Government School Relationship; Institutional Cooperation; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; Interschool Communication; Parent Teacher Cooperation; *Semantics; Social Influences
IDENTIFIERS *Partnerships in Education

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the changing nature of societal perspectives and the social contexts of educational partnerships or collaborations through a semantic analysis of the literature on educational cooperation and related educational themes and practices. In addition, a continuum of leitmotives on educational partnerships drawn from historic and current writings is reviewed for their influences on contemporary practices. From these research bases, a predictive model for trends or cycles in educational partnerships is offered with a focus on how government will support such collaborations in the 1990s. The conclusion--that state governments should initiate projects that bring faculty from the primary, secondary, undergraduate, and graduate segments of American education to plan educational improvement strategies together--underscores the point that any restructuring of American schooling requires cooperative involvement among all its external and internal constituencies. (JAM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED311563

THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF EDUCATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS:

A SEMANTIC REVIEW

by Dr. David L . Stoloff, Associate Professor,
Division of Ed'l. Foundations and Interdivisional Studies
Cal. State University, Los Angeles,
Los Angeles, CA 90032

a paper presented at the
Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
San Francisco, California
March 27-31, 1989

This paper presentation was supported in part by grants from the California Academic Partnership Program, the National Science Foundation-supported Southern California ACCESS Centers and Network, and the Division of Educational Foundations and Interdivisional Studies, School of Education, California State University, Los Angeles.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David L. Stoloff

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 021 334

What are the social contexts that nurture educators who work together towards a common goal? How have cooperative efforts between schools -- among faculty on the primary, secondary, and university levels -- been viewed within and across their institutions? What are the semantics of such cooperation? Why do some cooperative efforts succeed while others fail?

This paper examines the changing nature of societal perspectives and the social contexts of educational partnerships or collaborations through a semantic analysis of related educational themes and practices and a review of selected literature on the educational cooperation. A continuum of leitmotives on educational partnerships drawn from historic and current writings is reviewed for their influences on contemporary practice. From these research bases, the author builds a predictive model for trends or cycles on educational/communal collaborations. Expectations on how governmental and educational agencies will support collaborations in the 1990s conclude this discussion.

A REVIEW OF WORDS AND WRITINGS ON EDUCATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS

Schools and universities are separated by divisions in their goals, student populations, status, and roles in their communities. In the past few years, there has been a renewal of interest in collaborations to bridge these divisions between these two forms of educational

institutions. After discussing the vocabulary of cooperation and the writings of Dewey (1899), Illich (1971), Eisler (1987), and others with both national and international perspectives on such collaborations, this paper discusses general principles that may be useful in supporting future partnerships in education.

The Semantics of Cooperation

Education takes place within formal schools, nonformal training and recreation programs, and informal interactions communicating the information for societal initiations and maintenance. In times when a prevailing perception surrounding the formal school -- primary, secondary, and university levels -- calls for greater effectiveness as measured by student outcomes and societal problem-solving, diverse agencies chose to become more involved in the schools.

The formal vocabulary of educational researchers is reflected in the sources on which they chose to rely and in the categorization of the topics on which they write. The sources reviewed in this paper are the ERIC (Educational Resources in Circulation) thesaurus, the EUDISED (the European Documentation and Information System for Education, Council of Europe) thesaurus, the Library of Congress Subject Headings, and the Subject Index of the 1989 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Although conversations on these topics are not constrained

by reference to these sources, in searching the literature and educator will initially rely on ERIC indices or the Library of Congress. The Council of Europe's EUDISED is viewed as "an important step towards improving contacts among educational systems in Europe" through the development of a common vocabulary for educators. The Library of Congress is the reference core for most university and school libraries. The Library of Congress and ERIC serve as two sources for an American Educational Researcher studying a specific topic. EUDISED is becoming a source for European scholars. Referring to the Subject Index of the 1989 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association may also suggest the current relative interest of a research topic.

TABLE 1 lists ERIC descriptors related to cooperative efforts between schools cataloged from ERIC's first twenty years, from its inception in 1966 to the end of 1986, in its two indices -- the Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE) and Research in Education (RIE). Some of the terms commonly used for educational cooperation are not included. COLLABORATION in ERIC is linked to COLLABORATIVE DECISION MAKING which is seem as a synonym for PARTICIPATIVE DECISION MAKING. PARTNERSHIP appears as PARTNERSHIP TEACHER, which refers to two teachers sharing one faculty position. ALLIANCE, LEAGUE, and COALITION are not listed in the ERIC Thesaurus. COOPERATIVE LEARNING was first catalogued in

F ile: cooperic

TABLE 1

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES IN CIRCULATION (ERIC) TERMS
FOR EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION-PARTNERSHIP AND
THEIR OCCURRENCES IN
THE CURRENT INDEX TO JOURNALS IN EDUCATION (CIJE)
AND RESEARCH IN EDUCATION (RIE)
1966 - 1986

TERMS AND DATE INITIATED	NUMBER OF CITATIONS CIJE	RIE	TOTAL
SCHOOL COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIP-7/1966	3082	4333	7415
COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS - 7/1966	1235	2371	3606
SCHOOL BUSINESS RELATIONSHIP-3/1980	1639	1853	3492
GOVERNMENT SCHOOL RELATIONSHIP-7/'77	1061	1573	2634
PARENT SCHOOL RELATIONSHIP-7/1966	1103	1378	2481
AGENCY COOPERATION - 3/1980	546	1791	2337
COOPERATIVE PLANNING -7/1966	649	1317	1966
STUDENT SCHOOL RELATIONSHIP-7/1966	1042	809	1851
COLLEGE SCHOOL COOPERATION - 7/1966	678	1010	1688
COOPERATIVE EDUCATION - 7/1966	562	1010	1572
COMMUNITY EDUCATION - 7/1966	626	888	1514
TEACHER ASSOCIATIONS - 7/1966	620	539	1159
COOPERATION - 3/1978	602	486	1088
COOPERATING TEACHERS - 7/1966	304	462	766
INTERCOLLEGIATE COOPERATION - 3/1980	305	374	679
FAMILY SCHOOL RELATIONSHIP-7/1966	243	422	665
PARTICIPATIVE DECISION MAKING-8/1982	261	293	554
COMMUNITY COOPERATION - 7/1966	189	360	549
SOCIAL NETWORKS - 11/1982	108	129	237
COMMUNITY COORDINATION - 7/1966	65	156	221
POLICE SCHOOL RELATIONSHIP-7/1966	90	112	202
PARENT ASSOCIATIONS - 9/1968	25	151	176
COOPERATIVES - 7/1966	53	104	157
PARTNERSHIP TEACHER - 7/1966	5	9	14

ERIC during the fall of 1986 and by the end of 1988 was listed for less than 30 citations per month.

Of the ERIC citations related to educational cooperation, the descriptor SCHOOL COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIP seems to have attracted the most citations -- over 7,400 in twenty years. COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS follows in second with less than half the number of citations. (In contrast, TEACHER EDUCATION, another ERIC descriptor referenced over 10,700 citations in the same period; SCIENCE INSTRUCTION over 2,700; EDUCATIONAL MEDIA over 2,000; and MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION over 1,000 citations.) ERIC introduced the third highest descriptor, SCHOOL BUSINESS RELATIONSHIP in March 1980; the fourth, GOVERNMENT SCHOOL RELATIONSHIP in September 1977; and the sixth, AGENCY COOPERATION, in March 1980. COLLEGE SCHOOL COOPERATION draws the ninth largest number of citations. If the number of citations to which a descriptor is linked is any indication of interest by the educational community, then cooperation between schools and other non-educational agencies -- the community, business, and government -- seems to have greater focus from the late 1970s on.

EUDISED (the European Documentation and Information System for Education, Council of Europe) thesaurus was designed to create a common vocabulary for educational researchers in Europe (Viet and Van Slypl (1984).

Descriptors related to educational cooperation found in EUDISED include:

COALITION	PARENT-SCHOOL RELATION
NETWORK ANALYSIS	PARENT-TEACHER RELATION
PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION	SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATION
TEACHERS' ORGANIZATION	TEACHER-PUPIL RELATION
TRADE UNION	PARENTS' ORGANIZATION
COOPERATION	SCHOOL-EDUCAND RELATION

EUDISED does not list COLLABORATION, PARTNERSHIP, ALLIANCE, or LEAGUE as descriptors in its thesaurus. Additionally, EUDISED does not include a variant on COLLEGE SCHOOL COOPERATION. This suggests that partnerships between school and universities may not be of particular focus within European educational research.

Within the subject headings of the Library of Congress in the United States are some descriptors related to educational cooperation. PARTNERSHIP is listed with such variants as LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, SILENT PARTNERSHIP, and MEDICAL PARTNERSHIP. Readers interested in UNIVERSITY COOPERATION are referred to EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION, COLLEGE COOPERATION, or INTER-COLLEGE COOPERATION. The Subject Headings also include PARENT-TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS, ALLIED HEALTH PROFESSIONS, NETWORK ANALYSIS, and COALITION. The Library of Congress does not have subject headings that for school-community, school-college, or school-business relationships.

At the 1989 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, there was one session referenced under

PARTNERSHIPS (the session in which this paper was presented), 15 sessions referenced by COLLABORATION, 8 by COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH, and 1 by COLLEGIALITY. COOPERATIVE LEARNING was represented at 6 sessions. There were 7 sessions on PARENT INVOLVEMENT, 1 on PARENTING, and 6 on PARENTS. ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE was discussed in 6 sessions, ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES in 3, ORGANIZATIONAL THEORY in 2, and ORGANIZATIONS in 4. PARADIGM SHIFTS was discussed in one session. Although participation in these 61 sessions would occupy a researcher for the entire AERA conference, they represent less than 5% of all the sessions that one might attend. Partnerships among schools, universities, communities, businesses, and other social agencies seems to be an interest under the conference theme of "The Interdependence of Research and Practice", but not a major focus. In contrast, descriptors with 10 or more sessions at the 1989 AERA meeting include --

ASSESSMENT (21)
CAREER DEVELOPMENT (12)
COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT (11)
COLLABORATION (15)
CURRICULUM (19)
DROPOUTS (14)
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION (11)
EDUCATIONAL REFORM (23)
EVALUATION (26)
HIGHER EDUCATION (15)
INSTRUCTION (12)
INTERNATIONAL (11)
LEADERSHIP (10)
LITERACY (13)
MATHEMATICS EDUCATION (16)
MOTIVATION (13)
AT-RISK STUDENTS (19)
CLASSROOM PROCESSES (11)
COGNITIVE PROCESSES (13)
COMPUTER APPLICATIONS (10)
CURRICULUM THEORY (14)
EARLY CHILDHOOD (10)
EDUCATIONAL POLICY (13)
EQUITY (10)
GRADUATE STUDENTS (14)
HISTORY (21)
INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN (11)
ITEM RESPONSE THEORY (IRT) (14)
LEARNING (10)
MATHEMATICS (13)
MINORITIES (16)
POLICY (18)

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION (15)
READING (15)
RESEARCH METHODS (14)
SCHOOL REFORM (12)
STATISTICS (15)
WRITING (14)
QUALITATIVE RESEARCH (14)
RESEARCH AGENDA (10)
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT (10)
SCIENCE EDUCATION (14)
TEACHER EDUCATION (39)

If the use of vocabulary influences subsequent action, then the absence of focus on educational cooperation may suggest that this area has not generally been a key concern or area of research interest. The addition of new descriptors within ERIC in the last ten years implies that there may be an increase of interest in educational cooperation in the future. The following literature review suggests that although this topic has not been very prominent in educational research, cooperation has been an undercurrent in educational thought over a long period of time.

John Dewey on Cooperation in Education

In 1900, John Dewey wrote about the waste of education in his "School and Society". In describing the training schools for teachers, he noted that "the college is shut off from contact with children and youth. Its members, to a great extent, away from home and forgetting their own childhood, become eventually teachers with a large amount of subject-matter at command, with little knowledge of how this is related to the minds of those to whom it is to be taught. In this division between what to teach and how to teach, each side suffers from the separation."

Dewey called for a free interaction between all parts of the school system. He felt that "there is much of utter triviality of subject-matter in elementary and secondary education. When we investigate it, we find that it is full of facts taught that are not facts, which have to be unlearned later on. Now, this happens because the 'lower' parts of our system are not in vital connection with the 'higher'. The university or college, in its idea, is a place of research, where investigations is going on, a place of libraries and museums, where the best resources of the past are gathered, maintained and organized. It is, however, as true in the school as in the university that the spirit of inquiry can be got only through and with the attitude of inquiry. The pupil must learn what has meaning, what enlarges his horizon, instead of mere trivialities. He must become acquainted with truths, instead of things that are regarded as such fifty years ago, or that are taken as interesting by the misunderstanding of a partially educated teacher. It is difficult to see how these ends can be reached except as the most advanced part of the educational system is in complete interaction with the most rudimentary."

Dewey deemed this complete interaction between 'lower' and 'higher' education to be essential for the creation of a democratic society but despaired that they were not in vital connection in his day. "We need", Professor Dewey wrote,

"an educational system where the process of moral-intellectual development is in practice as well as in theory a cooperative transaction of inquiry engaged in by free, independent human beings who treat ideas and the heritage of the past as means and methods for the further enrichment of life, quantitatively and qualitatively, who use the good attained for the discovery and establishment of something better." Dewey designed a model for such a school that incorporated the home, business, technical schools, the research laboratory, the university, library, museum, and garden parks and country into the daily life of the student. Unfortunately, he was unable to put this ideal into long-term practice even within a University School setting.

Lessons Learned on Cooperation since 1966

Twenty years ago, the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education and The Association of Student Teaching commissioned a study of the relationships of schools and colleges in providing laboratory experiences in teachers education. Smith et. al (1967) report that school-college partnerships offer promises and pitfalls. The first promise is that the total profession can learn to work together in a partnership of equals. Partnerships may allow for the breakthrough in the implementation of new ideas for education. They may organize university and school resources for specific tasks. The university may more effectively fulfill one of its mission as being an

educational resource for the schools and for the community. Improving in-service teacher education through the partnership might indirectly improve classroom instruction throughout the school.

These promises may also bring pitfalls. There may be a fear of take-over by one of the institutions of the political control and design of objectives. Partnerships may create system-wide conformity in decision-making and in teaching methods. Centralization of decision-making in the partnership might decrease the speed of day to day reaction to changes on the school site.

Smith et. al. suggest ways to avoid pitfalls for partnerships. They recommend that the educational partners should

> 1) organize a legitimate route for the injection of new ideas that could allow leadership to arise from various sources,
> 2) arrange the power structure so that the partners are responsible for their domains but may influence each other through discussion,
> 3) set up organizational structures which are viable enough to survive beyond the strength of one or two enthusiastic personalities,
> 4) provide for a system of checks and balances of power,
> 5) plan a gradual emergence of inter-institutional structure, and
> 6) insure that there are executive positions with described duties and decision-making authority.

In his description of a school-college collaboration between an East Coast urban, public university and a middle school in a large urban school district, Trubowitz (1986)

suggests that there are 8 stages in the growth and development of such collaborations. Stage I is one of "hostility and skepticism" as the partners get to know each other and vent their frustrations about past school-college cooperative ventures that were not successful. Stage II is a period of "lack of trust" as the partners build mutual confidence through joint efforts and role merging. Stage III is a "period of truce" when there is equal participation in school-based projects. Stage IV brings "mixed approval" as short-term successes are recognized and individuals who do not flourish within collaborations find other projects. "Acceptance" by both the school and college communities arrives in Stage V as mutual benefits are realized. Stage VI is a time of "regression" as the original collaborative vision is blurred through attrition, faculty promotion, and changes in local funding. Entering partners with a transfusion of ideas at this point leads to "renewal" and Stage VII. Continuing progress in the collaboration is the final Stage VIII.

Lieberman (1986) suggests that ambiguity and flexibility more aptly describe collaborations than certainty and rigidity and that conflict is inevitable. She adds that the process of change in schools are dominated by how ideas are introduced, organized, supported, and implemented and that the most successful collaborations are people-centered. Hord (1986) reviews ten essential elements for cooperative

and collaborative efforts that include the needs and interests of the participants; the time, energy, resources expended; organizational factors, control, leadership, personal traits of the partners; and the exchange of communication and perceptions. Successful collaborations maximize the sharing of responsibility for tasks and the interests of all participants in the goals of the project.

DeBevoise (1986) also stresses the need of the collaboration to work toward the consumer satisfaction of all of the participants, the need to find common and unifying interests. A successful collaboration should become a "community of believers" that have a high level of administrative support, realistic goals, and an effective communications system to reach all the participants.

Berman and McLaughlin (1978) suggest that partnerships have a better chance of succeeding if

1) the projects are originated within the school and not imposed from without,
2) the teachers and the administration are convinced or the scope and promise of the project and jointly participate in the planning,
3) the teachers are convinced that the innovation has educational promise and benefits for the students,
4) there is a professional motivation,
5) there are clear and specific goals of the project,
6) the project results in specific outcomes and material preparation,
7) there is a well-conducted staff training procedure with support activities,
8) there is classroom support for the project,
9) the principal is supportive of the project, and
10) there are good teacher working relationships.

They add that elementary school projects may be more likely to achieve goals and produce teacher change than projects in the secondary schools and that less experienced teachers are more likely to actively participate in projects than more veteran teachers. For a partnership to succeed, there must also be positive teacher attitudes towards enhancing their professional competence.

In his evaluation of the curriculum enhancement projects participation in the California Academic Partnership Program from 1984 - 1987, Galligani (1987) also found several characteristics that contribute to effective partnerships. He suggests that that the following general characteristics may be essential for a successful collaboration:

1) clear establishment of common goals which are recognized and developed cooperatively,
2) development of mutual trust and respect among faculty,
3) provision of sufficient time to develop and strengthen the relationships both among faculty and administrators,
4) quality of the individuals who have primary responsiblities for the development of the partnership,
5) continued and constant interaction between "top" management and the faculty directly involved in project,
6) understanding the different cycles and languages of the various educational segments involved in the partnership,
7) periodic formative evaluation,
8) shared responsibility and accountability among the partners,
9) crisp lines of communication inclusive of all individuals in the partnership,
10) establishment of an empowered advisory committee,
11) stimulation of faculty-to-faculty interaction through a variety of means, including a stipend of between $700 and $1,000 per year and release time.

Other strategies for successful partnerships include the recognition that teachers are curriculum experts and that they are the best persons to teach other teachers, that the project activities may be affected by external environmental factors, and that partnership projects take a great deal of effort to succeed.

Goodlad (1988) suggests that cooperation between school and universities should be a natural process. School and Universities are in the same business -- Education. They have overlapping self-interests in the area of Teacher Education and Curriculum Development. Productive school-university symbiosis also has "an expectation of satisfying self- interests at a high level that the hard work of effective collaboration is seen as worth it." Yet, there seems to be impedients to educational cooperation. Goodlad concludes that "schools of education have not yet generally embraced the notion that is is important for them to be closely involved with the problems of schools." He finds that there is "no great enthusiasm on the part of many school administrators to be closely involved with neighboring universities." He is "not convinced at this stage that the third characteristic of a symbiotic partnership - a strong conviction that there is enough in it for each partner to warrant unswerving commitment, including the allocation of resources - is sufficiently strong...For schools and teacher education programs to improve to the

level of serving society well, their self-interests must be joined with the common welfare. Maximum benefits will occur when self-interests mesh nicely with the public interest."

Shanker (1988) and Futrell (1988) describes this need for a partnership between teachers and administrators within schools. Shanker, the current President of the American Federation of Teachers, states that in a successful partnership, "those who are affected by decisions and who must live with the results are the ones who actually make the decisions." Futrell, the current President of the National Education Association, concludes that "only through a mutual respect rooted in understanding and empathy will we, teachers and administrators, gain the strength and wisdom to accomplish the tasks before us."

Schlechty and Whitford (1988) add that successful collaborations require an educational leadership that articulates a shared vision of the future. They discuss three types of school-university collaborations:

* cooperation - one helps the other; personal association;
* symbiosis - the two help each other; organizational alliance;
* organic - both work together in a joint venture for the common good

They suggest that "as long as the focus of collaboration is couched in terms of functions that 'belong' more to one partner than to another, then issues of power, authority,

and control will continue to dominate any collaborative venture."

The above authors in the United States suggest that although partnerships in education are logical extensions of the theory and practice of educators on all levels, organizational issues of self-interest, promotion, structure, and vocabulary may hinder cooperative efforts. In the next section, a review of partnerships in other nations suggest that this dilemma is faced world-wide.

International Lessons on School-University Partnerships

School-university partnerships in other nations also depend on the sharing of common goals, the use of incentives, strong lines of communication, and mutual respect among the participants. In this section, a continuum of partnerships from educational situations outside of the United States will illustrate some of the other elements of successful school-university collaborations.

Having a societal unity of thought on education strengthens educational collaborations on all levels. Holmes (1981) suggests that "Soviet educationists make every attempt to create a unified system of schooling throughout the whole country.... Uniformity is an objective; equality the aim." Ben-David (1977) observes a similar confluence of goals in professional education in the United States. He notes that "in education, collusion between universities,

professional associations, and local governments was possible because education is a monopolistic service and local educational systems do not have to prove themselves in competition....Internally, a system like American professional education is prone to deterioration of standards" due to the common goals of mutual maintenance of position by the university and local educational authorities. McGinn and Street (1986), in a study of Latin American educational decentralization, confirm that "a state is likely to share power only with those groups that have projects and beliefs that contribute to the project of the state." They add that "participation of all the people first requires the achievement of consensus at least about the value of widespread participation."

During the Summer of 1988, the author surveyed Ministries/Departments of Education in the states and provinces of North America and in the 153 nations in the United Nations on how their offices encourage cooperation among the various segments of the educational system and among community agencies. By September 1988, this open-ended questionaire returned 22 respondents from 8 nations (Canada, Grenada, Luxembourg, Malawi, Papua New Guinea, Sweden, Tuvalu, and the United States) and 8 states (Alabama, California, Hawaii, Kansas, Maryland, New Mexico, Ohio, and South Carolina). Stoloff (1988) found that Ministries/Departments of Education through their financial

support, the system-wide standardization of curriculum, and co-sponsoring community programs engender cooperation among pre-collegiate schools. Since post-secondary education is not often under the direct influence of the Ministries/ Departments of Education, encouragement of school-university cooperation usually proceeds through indirect channels or through short-term, specially funded projects. Ministries/Departments of Education play more direct roles in encouraging cooperation between community resources and individual schools and other intra- international educational agencies. These survey responses also suggest that several diverse educational systems have already established strategies to increase collaboration between schools, universities, and the communities they serve.

One impediment for governmental agencies to strengthen further partnerships in education was suggested in a correspondence from the the office of the Secretary for Education and Culture in Malawi. The respondent wrote --

> we regret to inform you that we do not have programms that specifically encourage cooperative efforts among all the different segments of Eduation. Our Education System is highly centralised and as such, cooperative efforts among different sections are coordinated through meetings of heads of sections or by direct contact between them.

The perception that both the school and the university are members of the same community seems to be an essential condition for successful collaborations. Universities tend

to be creatures of a centralized political system, not of single communities; individual schools tend to rely on local autonomy. Robinson (1986) reports that the people-run schools, minban schools, in the People's Republic of China, declined in number as administrative centralization increased.

Following a Comparative Education review of Other Schools and Ours, King (1979) suggests that the "expansion of learning, the pace of its development, and the systematic utilization not only of applied science but of its opportunities in the social field, require the partnership [King's emphasis] of many people not so far considered even as participants in the educational process." Parents, students, and community experts may need an increased role in the decision-making of the educational institutions to increase the strength of the partnership. King suggests that a third idiom, or phase, of education is arising due to educational technology. This emerging theme in education "represents a repudiation of the previous authority system"...and "puts far more emphasis on sharing, on concern, and on judgment."

Education as a communal function depends on the structure and goals of society. Within a community, whether in the United States or other nations, involvement in education and educational collaborations are developed and nurtured at different times for different goals. As

King suggests, new ways of delivering and making sense of ever-increasing amounts of information may influence the structure and function of education and cooperation in the future.

Illich (1971) offers a perspective on educational cooperation that is controlled by the learner. Illich describes a deschooled society where "learning webs", networks of learners, gather together to discuss a specific topic or project on a voluntary, cooperative basis. These "learning webs" are ad-hoc educational structures for specific cooperative purposes by willing individuals. . In Illich's paradigm, "the good educational system should have three purposes: it should provide all who want to learn with access to available resources at any time in their lives; empower all who want to share what they know to find those who want to learn it from them; and, finally, furnish all who want to present an issue to the public with the opportunity to make their challenge known."

Ferguson (1980) parallels Illich's vision of future education by discussing <u>transpersonal education</u>, a transforming process that emphasizes learning how to learn, education as a process free of formal structures and rigid expectations of the learner, and knowledge as a continuum, rather than subjects. The education of the future, according to Ferguson, will be a,synergistic, eqalitarian,

lifelong process that encourages community input and control and age group integration.

Eisler (1987) describes a "partnership" society prior to the "dominator" societies detailed in written history. This partnership society is characterized by Eisler to be devoted to individual actualization, with men and women playing equal, powerful roles in affiliation. Eisler suggests the word, "gylany", to describe these communities. Gylany represents neither matriarchy nor patriarchy, but the linkages of men and women in a purposeful society without hierarchies based on the threat of force. Education in these partnership, gylanic societies is by a process of individual nurturing and discovery by one's own pace. Eisler predicts that we are on the verge of a return to these partnership societies of the forgotten past. As the partnership society replaces the present dominator, hierarchial society, Eisler expects that all cooperative activities will be appropriately valued and rewarded and that education and "the life-formative years will be the active concern of both women and men." Learning in this partnership society "rather than being designed to socialize a child to adjust to her or his place in a world of rank orderings," will be "a lifelong process for maximizing flexibility and creativity at all stages of life."

Illich, Ferguson, and Eisler suggest that a structural change in the delivery of education and an attitudinal

change about the process of education may increase the amount of educational cooperation. The stress in current education on hierarchies, specific subject-matter domains, and segmental integrity has hindered the cooperative efforts of professional educators in the past. These writers believe that a paradigm shift on the nature and function of education would provide the environment for lifelong learning and greater societal communications and understanding.

Expectations for the 1990s

The California Postsecondary Education Commission (1988) in a evaluation study of the California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP) characterizes the 1950s as an era of national-level collaboration, especially in the revision of curriculum in science and math. During the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, close cooperation between college faculty and secondary school teachers waned as the orientation shifted to direct services to specific groups of students. The current increased support for science and math education, and in academic partnerships may portend a renewed interest in educational collaborations on the local and national level. The writers of this evaluation study suggest that the "CAPP's curriculum projects return to the proven position that interested higher education faclty working directly with committed secondary teachers and active

administrative support can improve the curriculum and positively affect students's preparation for college."

Such collaborative curricular efforts, as the CAPP projects and the National Science Foundation-supported Southern California ACCESS Centers and Network, are designed to increase the number of students in postsecondary education and science and technology careers from groups that are currently underrepresented. By bringing faculty from the primary, secondary, undergraduate, and graduate segments together to plan strategies towards this goal, these Partnerships build new personal bridges within the educational continuum.

In Restructuring California Education: Recommendations to the California Business Roundtable, the authors (BW Associates, 1988) envision an evolving design for public education in the 21st century. They call for the greater empowerment of parents, teachers, and principals within autonomous schools; an expanded and focused school with consolidated core academics and a post-10 student option of specialization; and upgrading the process of becoming and developing as a teacher through the establishment of a multi-tiered teaching system with higher salary rates. These envisioned cooperative efforts, according to the authors, will produce several benefits. In schools, formative peer reviews would foster collegiality among educators. The business community would promote programs

(e.g., job-sharing, lending specialists to schools as Adjunct Teachers) to help resolve the critical teacher shortage. These proposals will "rely on grass-roots voluntary actions and much cooperation on the part of school boards, districts, unions, professional associations, businesses, principals, teachers, parents, and community members." Regretfully, colleges of education and educational researchers are not assigned proactive roles in this planning for the future.

Ost (1989) suggests that the culture within the educational community is being currently transmitted to the next generation of prospective teachers on a continuing basis of 15-20 years. The current use of vocabulary, the concepts discussed in key literature, and the contemporary state of cooperative efforts set the cultural assumptions for well into the 21st century.

The history of educational cooperation seems to reflect a similar pattern over the last thirty years. A twenty year cycle of educational cooperation for curriculum development and for restructuring the social structure of the school in alternating ten year periods may generalize current history. In the mid-1950s and the mid-1960s, schools and universities cooperated to develop science and math curriculum in reaction to Sputnik. The National Science Foundation and other agencies concerned with science and math education promoted the Summer Institutes to renew

K-12 science and math education. Faculty from schools and universities cooperated in developing new curriculum -- i.e. the Biological Science Curriculum Series (BSCS) and innovative instructional materials. In the mid-1960s to the mid-1970s, more focus was placed on the social aspects of schooling. Partnerships were formed between the school and community. Local control and decentralization of school authority were supported by university faculty writing in support of greater individualization in education. As the demographic mass of the baby boom completed secondary education, the schools began to build walls separating the open classroom. Between 1975 and 1985, educational cooperation has been built on the rationale of curriculum development in the basic skills areas -- first discipline, then reading, writing, and now science and mathematics.

Given this twenty year cycle of alternating curriculum development (function) and school organization (structure), then the period between the mid-1980s and the mid-1990s may be one of restructuring. In support of this hypothesis, writers such as Anderson (1989) state that "the emotional, mythological and intellectual support bases for the self-contained classroom have crumbled." Cooperative learning and teaching, schools-within-schools, reducing the general school leaving age to 16 with specialized options until 18, and refocusing on students at-risk and social

relations may shift the emphasis of educational thought from "what is being taught" to "how and why the learner and the teacher may accomplish the task together". Family choice of schools, local control, and educational vouchers are again being seriously discussed in the popular press as they were in the late 1960s and early 1970s. As the baby boomlet washes over the schools, parents will expect the schools of their childhood for their children. We may see a return of the mid-1960s with an emphasis on the use of computers for the individualization of instruction. Schools options may be restructuring to satisfy the achievement expectations of this generation's parents and to serve as a safety net for children from families that have not yet had positive experiences in the narrowly acculturative school process. If Colleges of Education do not become part of the solution in this restructuring through cooperative involvement in the process, they may by mid-1995 be considered part of the problem as more and more states turn to school districts, the mandarinate of testing, and on-the-job training to ease the predicted teacher shortage. If the cycle holds true, by 1995 the schools will have returned to the basics of literacy, perhaps this time with an emphasis on video and computer networking. Between 2001 and 2005, science and mathematics, perhaps based on the skills needed in space, may capture the interest of the educational world.

If cooperative efforts in education are considered to be unusual, problematic, and under-rewarding, then such partnerships will not become current either now or in the near future. Perhaps it is time for a paradigm shift in education towards a reorganization of the diverse levels into a coordinated system of cooperative efforts towards common goals. Only then will the social context and culture of education allow for cooperation to become a full part of the vocabulary, semantics, and actions of educators.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Robert H. "Partnership: Piquancy and Potentiation". Kappa Delta Pi Record, Winter 1989, pp. 35-39.

Ben-David, Joseph. Centers of Learning. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1979, pg. 67.

Berman, Paul; Martz, Robert; McCorry, Maureen; Minicucci, Catherine; Nelson, Beryl; Shipps, Dorothy; Tepke, Glen; and Weiler, Daniel (BW Project Team). Restructuring California Education: A Design for Public Education in the Twenty-First Century: Recommendations to the California Business Roundtable. Berkeley: Berman, Weiler Associates, 1988.

Berman, Paul and McLaughlin, Milbrey Wallin, "Factors affecting Implementation and Continuation", as cited in Rosalind Miller and Allan Spanjer, "The Library Media Specialist as Change Maker: Implications for Research", in Shirley L. Aaron and Pat R. Scales, School Library Media Annual 1985: Volume Three. Littleton, CO: Libraries Unlimited, Inc., 1985, pp. 324 - 326.

California Postsecondary Education Commission. Evaluation of the California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP). Sacramento, CA: CPEC, March 1988.

DeBevoise, Wynn. "Collaboration: Some Principles of

Bridgework." Educational Leadership, February 1986, v. 43, n. 5, pp. 9-12.

Dewey, John, "School and Society" and "Introduction to 'The Use of Resources in Education'", as cited in Martin S. Dworkin, Dewey on Education: Selections. New York: Teachers College Press, 1959, pp. 75, 80, 133-134.

Eisler, Raine. The Chalice and the Blade: Our History, Our Future. New York: Harper and Row, 1987.

Ferguson, Marilyn. The Aquarian Conspiracy: Personal and Social Transformation in the 1980s. Los Angeles: J. P. Tarcher, Inc., 1980.

Futrell, Mary Hatwood. "The Importance of Partnership." Kappa Delta Pi Record, Spring 1988, 24, 3, pp. 74-75.

Galligani, Dennis J. Effective Relationships for School/College Partnerships: A Qualitative Evaluation of the Curriculum Enhancement Projects Participating in the California Academic Partnership Program 1984 - 1987. California State University: California Academic Partnership Program, 1987.

Goodlad, John I. "School-University Partnerships: A Social Experiment." Kappa Delta Pi Record, Spring 1988, pp. 77-80.

Holmes, Brian. "Education in the Soviet Union", in Edward Ignas and Raymond J. Corsini, editors, Comparative Educational Systems. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1981, pp. 338.

Hord, Shirley M. "A Synthesis of Research on Organizational Collaboration." Educational Leadership, February 1986, v. 43, n. 5, pp. 22-26.

Houston, James E. Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors: 11th Edition - 1987. Phoenix, AR: Oryx Press, 1986.

Illich, Ivan. Deschooling society. New York: Perennial York, 1971.

Lieberman, Ann. "Collaborative Work." Educational Leadership, February 1986, v. 43, n. 5, pp. 4-8.

King, Edmund J. Other Schools and Ours: Comparative Studies for Today: Fifth Edition. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979, pp. 42-44.

Library of Congress Subject Headings, Volume I & II: Tenth Edition. Washington: Library of Congress, 1986.

McGinn, Noel and Street, Susan. "Educational Decentralization: Weak State or Strong State." Comparative Education Review, v. 30, no. 4, November 1986, pp. 490.

Ost, David H. "The Culture of Teaching." The Educational Forum. Winter 1989, pp. 163-182.

Robinson, Jean C. "Decentralization, Money, and Power: The Case of People-run Schools in China." Comparative Education Review, v. 30, no. 1, February 1986, pp. 77.

Schlechty, Phillip C. and Whitford, Betty Lou. "Types and Characteristics of School-University Collaboration." Kappa Delta Pi Record, Spring 1988, 24, 3, pp. 81-83.

Shanker, Albert. "Partnerships between Teachers and Administrators: How 'They' Became 'We'." Kappa Delta Pi Record, Spring 1988, 24, 3, pp. 72-73.

Smith, E. Brooks; Olsen, Hans C.; Johnson, Patrick J.; Barbour, Chandler, editors, Partnership in Teacher Education. Washington, DC: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1967.

Stoloff, David L. "Encouraging Educational Intra-Communications: Governmental Support of Educational Cooperation." A paper presented at the Western Regional Meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society, Sacramento, October 21-22, 1988.

Trubowitz, Sidney. "Stages in the Development of School-College Collaboration." Educational Leadership, February 1986, v. 43, n. 5, pp. 18-21.

Viet, Jean and Van Slypl, Georges. EUDISED: Multilingual Thesaurus for Information Processing in the Field of Education. Berlin: Mouton Publishers, 1984.